

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVIII, No. 24

MONDAY, MAY 4, 1925

WHOLE No. 501

SCRIBNER

THE ROBERTS AND ROLFE EDITION

Vergil's Aeneid

Books I-VI

By **ARTHUR W. ROBERTS**

*Head of Classical Department,
Brookline High School*

and **JOHN C. ROLFE**

*Head of Department of
Latin, University of
Pennsylvania*

Price, \$1.80

*With introduction, notes,
appendix, vocabulary,
and Ovid selections.*

THE new *Roberts and Rolfe Vergil's Aeneid*, with its clear-cut, regular typography, smooth-finished paper, well-chosen illustrations, and attractive durable binding is a basal text of distinctly pleasing appearance, in every detail especially planned for class-room use.

From front cover to back cover, the material of the text is arranged to afford the greatest pleasure, convenience, helpfulness, and inspiration.

An outline of the story immediately precedes each book and a summary of the last six books not generally read in the Latin is included. Summaries, questions for review, notes and appendix are unusually full and explicit.

The new Ovid requirements prescribed by the College Entrance Examination Board for 1926, 1927, and 1928 will be supplied for the next School year on all orders for the *Roberts and Rolfe Edition* whenever the course of study requires these selections.

End papers show a map of Aeneas's wanderings

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Educational Department

New York

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

San Francisco

"I am most enthusiastic over the results from the
JENNER-GRANT FIRST YEAR OF LATIN

"It is the most sensible Latin book which I have ever seen. The pupils like it, are always interested and keen. They move forward steadily together. It does not seem hard to keep the slower ones up to a pace that is fast enough to hold the interest and attention of the quicker ones. It does much to avoid making Latin the 'bug-bear' that it is to most pupils".
 H. G. HUDSON, *Country Day School, Newton, Mass.*

Have you Jenner's Hints for Teachers of First Year Latin?

A book well designed and executed to conserve initial enthusiasm, to reduce the mortality of the first year, and to give a year's work complete and valuable in and for itself.

BENJ. H. SANBORN & CO.

CHICAGO

NEW YORK

BOSTON

ELEMENTARY LATIN CLASSICS

A series of small, handy classics edited for beginners. They are bound in attractive blue cloth, are illustrated, and contain notes, exercises, and vocabularies.

The volumes now ready are:

Welch and Duffield: Caesar's Helvetian War

Welch and Duffield: Caesar's Invasion of Britain

Reed: Julia

PRICE: 48 cents.

Other volumes preparing are:

Morton: Legends of Gods and Heroes

Nall: Seven Kings of Rome

Sonnenschein: Pro Patria

Sonnenschein: Ora Maritima

Wilkinson: Legends of Rome

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

NEW YORK

BOSTON

CHICAGO

DALLAS

ATLANTA

SAN FRANCISCO

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVIII, No. 24

MONDAY, MAY 4, 1925

WHOLE No. 501

THE NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB SILVER JUBILEE MAY 23, 1925

It is not the policy of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY to give notice, in its reading columns, of coming meetings of Classical Associations, except, of course, of meetings of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, whose organ THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is. Yet so important an event as The Silver Jubilee of The New York Classical Club cannot be passed over in silence. This will be held on Saturday afternoon and evening, May 23.

In the afternoon, at 3.30, the *Antigone* of Sophocles will be given, in English, by the Hunter College Classical Club, in honor of the Jubilee, and in recognition of the work done for the Classics by The New York Classical Club—work so splendid alike in quantity and in quality. The performance is under the direction of Miss Viola I. Schmid, of The Classical Department of Hunter College. For the choral passages the Mendelssohn music will be used. Miss E. Adelaide Hahn, of The Classical Department of Hunter College, has rendered the Greek of the choruses into English verse adapted to the music. Professor Riess, of Hunter College, has rendered the rest of the play into English blank verse, on the basis of Jebb's prose translation.

The performance will be given in the Lewisohn Stadium, 137th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, New York City (adjoining The College of the City of New York).

Great pains is being taken with the production. The chorus of fifteen will be supplemented by a chorus from the Boys' High School, and by an orchestra of sufficient volume to support the voices.

Tickets for this performance may be had at fifty cents and at seventy-five cents. In addition voluntary contributions towards defraying the heavy costs of the production will be welcome. Tickets may be obtained from Professor Helen H. Tanzer, Hunter College, Lexington College and 68th Street, New York City. Contributions may also be sent to her.

It may be noted that the performance of the *Antigone* marks the Twentieth Anniversary of The Classical Club of Hunter College.

In the evening, at 7 o'clock, there will be a Dinner of The New York Classical Club, at the Hotel Marseilles, 103rd Street and Broadway, New York City. Tickets for the Dinner (and for 'Bus' transportation from the Lewisohn Stadium to the Hotel) may be had at \$3.50 each. They may be obtained from the Secretary-Treasurer of The New York Classical Club, Mr. Russell F. Stryker, High School, Flushing, Long Island, New York.

It is hoped that all lovers of the Classics will be deeply interested in this important event, and that they will testify to that interest by their presence both afternoon and evening, and by financial support of the play.

CHARLES KNAPP

THE MUSE, THE POET AND THE GRAMMARIAN¹

In the work of giving beautiful expression to human thought three partners share: the Muse, myth of the source of the creative power, the spark somewhere outside of man; the Poet, in whose heart the spark takes fire; and the Grammarian, an attendant who guards the spark, and in his lowly way helps to make the fire burn more brightly—in his *lowly* way, I say, unless he is cast in the mould, although not in the heroic proportions, of a Gildersleeve, whose going from us we are mourning this year, a Grammarian who made poetry out of philology!

Towards the end of the last century Jules Lemaitre wrote²: 'Soon the last poet will make his last offering of doves to the Muses'. He was wrong about the last poet, but even to-day, in America, at least, there are few offerings to the classic Muses. These goddesses are gone from their old haunts. They have hearkened to the call of Walt Whitman, and have "placarded 'Removed' and 'To Let' on their snowy Parnassus". Take lines like the following from Miss Lowell³:

Six flights up in an out-of-date apartment house,
Where all the door-jambs and wainscots are of black-
walnut,
And the last tenant died at the ripe age of eighty.

These lines make an old-fashioned grammarian wonder whether modern poetry has any Muses at all, and, if it has, whether they are even distantly related to the nymphic Muses of our greatest literary heritage.

For the Muse belongs solely to Latin and Greek tradition. No other race personified either the source of the poet's power or the keepers of the store of poetic material. Valmiki, poet of the Ramayana, received the gift of song from Brahm, just as the ancient Hebrew Psalmist found inspiration in Jehovah. Hiawatha's story was gathered in the woods and from the nests of birds, but no sprite held it in her keeping⁴. In the Kalevala men do not preserve the memory of past events, but live from day to day⁵. Beowulf and the Teutonic epic make the source of the story not a

¹Address of the President of the American Philological Association at its Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting, at the University of Chicago, December 29, 1924.

²On François Coppee, *Les Contemporains*, 1.83.

³Aquatint Framed in Gold, in Braithwait's *Anthology of Magazine Verse* for 1922, page 130 (reprinted from *The Nation*).

⁴Hiawatha, Introduction, lines 11, 25.

⁵Ch. Letourneau, *L'Évolution Littéraire*, 463 (Paris, 1894).

goddess, but man: 'Men have told me', sings the poet. And there is no parallel to the Muse in the French *Épopée* of the Middle Ages.

After the Renaissance, the poet either fashioned a patron saint in the image of the Muse, like Milton's Heavenly Muse, or Camôens's nymph of the Tagus, or else he kept the classic goddess herself, but with a change. Dante had invoked the Muses and High Genius and Memory—his own memory; and so the later poet was inclined to make out of the Muse *my* Muse. He individualized her, so that she often became hardly more than a mere projection of his own genius, his gift of song. Poetry was still held to be a gift—at least till the end of Victoria's reign—but the word *gift* was a fading metaphor, until at last the giver was all but forgotten. To-day the Muse may be likened to some old daguerreotype, packed away, perhaps, "six flights up in an out-of-date apartment house", in the attic of literature, a quaint object, preserved chiefly as an antique.

There is something saddening in the dethronement of a royal idea, one that has commanded the allegiance of great peoples. And the sadness is greater when the fancy has clothed the idea with a beautiful personality, like the Muse. For when an idea, thus beautifully embodied, touches the springs of our intellectual life, it becomes that 'wise myth', which, Professor Santayana tells us⁶, "reports the movement of the world's thought, and may inspire us with a wise sentiment in our attitude towards nature and life". The waning of a myth often marks the passing of some great movement of thought. Take the myth of Pan. Think of the bright promise of that summer day described by Herodotus⁷ when Pan met Pheidippides, and revealed himself as the helper of Athens, just before the golden age of Greek thought, and contrast it with that other day of which Plutarch tells us⁸, half a millennium later, after the Golden Age of Rome, when some sailors, bound from Egypt to Italy, heard a voice from the deep cry out, 'Announce that Great Pan is dead!'

That cry was false: Pan has been seen alive in England almost within a decade. Listen to this recent voice⁹:

When I go down the Gloucester lanes
My friends are deaf and blind.
Fast as they turn their stupid gaze,
The maenads leap behind.
And when I hear the fire-winged feet,
They only hear the wind.

Have I not chased the fleeting Pan
Through Cranham's sober trees?
Have I not sat on Painswick's hill
With a nymph upon my knees,
And she as rosy as the dawn,
And naked as the breeze?

Pan still lives; the nymphs—and therefore the Muses, for they are nymphs—still live! It is the growing deafness and blindness of the world that is threatening the dethronement of this royal idea of literature.

Just how much the world will lose if it does not recover its *senses* we can understand more clearly if we trace back the 'wise myth' of the Muse to its ultimate literary source.

I

In Roman and Hellenistic poetry the Muse was not individualized as in the days since the Renaissance, but she was more or less specialized, each member of the sisterhood presiding over a separate literary genre. In this period grammarians were writing biographies of the Muses, with more zeal for details than I can bring to my task this evening. For our purpose it is enough to recognize that the Muses were once nymphs, very likely of watersources, like the Roman Camenae, who were readily assimilated with them. We need not discuss the various derivations proposed for the word *mousa*. Our quest is the early literary tradition, and in this the Muse is in essence either the Rememberer or the Maddener.

For the Muse as Maddener the *locus classicus* is a passage in Plato's *Phaedrus*¹⁰. 'Madness', says Socrates, 'is necessary for him who approaches the Muses'. The Muse is not Memory. On the contrary, he says later, 'the Muses make men forget all'¹¹. Plato was right in making the Muses personify the maddening goad that drives men to exalted utterance. The Muses were originally the personalized impulses of nature, a sort of Freudian complex, if you will, but acting on man from without, not from within. Our earliest literary source which contains the germ of this view is Hesiod's Hymn to the Muses, prefixed to the *Theogony*¹². It leads us to Helicon.

The Heliconian Muses met Hesiod at the foot of their high and holy mountain, and spoke thus: 'Shepherds of the fields, ye base wretches, . . . we can utter many a fiction, and make it seem the truth; and when we will, we can give sweet voice to true tales'. 'Thus they spake', continues the poet, 'and they gave me a wand of laurel; they breathed upon me divine speech <that is, the poetic manner> that I might celebrate in song both the past and the future'.

From this passage two facts emerge: first, these Heliconian Muses embrace the whole realm of poetry, defined by the polar limits, fiction and truth, past and future; and, secondly, they breathe into the simple shepherd the gift of poetic expression. They inspire him; they 'enthuse' him. There is in them a mystic nature that we shall not find in the Olympian Muses of Homer. This mystic element gained power from an early blending with the cult of Dionysus, god of intoxication, ecstasy, and madness. Dionysus was born of a Boeotian mother. His birthplace was Nysa, and, according to Strabo¹³, a village of Helicon was called Nysa. Sophocles says¹⁴ that Lycurgus, in opposing the progress of Dionysus, 'angered the flute-loving Muses'. The ecstatic cult of Dionysus therefore helped at least to make the Muse the source of poetic inspiration.

⁶A Long Way Round to Nirvana, in *The Dial*, November 1923, page 438.

⁷De Defectu Oraculorum 17.

⁸J. E. Flecker, *Oak and Olive*, in *Poems of To-day*, English Association, 1922, page 70.

¹⁰245 A. ¹¹Phaedrus 259 B.

¹²Theogony 22-32. In its present condition the Hymn shows the grafting of the Olympian upon the Heliconian myth. See Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer*, 463-479.

¹³Strabo 14, page 405. ¹⁴Antigone 955-965.

Hesiod offered a tripod to the Muses of Helicon for his victory over Homer¹⁵, rightly, for the Heliconian Muses almost displaced the Olympian Muses of Homer in the later poets. Quintus of Smyrna, most conscientious follower of Homer, when he tells of the Muses mourning with Thetis for Achilles, follows Homer for the fact, but makes the Muses come from Helicon and return to Helicon¹⁶, as they did in Pindar¹⁷, but not in Homer. Ennius, another lover of Homer, dreamt that he received his inspiration on Helicon¹⁸, as Callimachus had done before him¹⁹. Pindar²⁰ calls the Muses Heliconian, never Olympian. It is true that he calls them also Pierian²¹, and Pieria was a valley at the foot of Olympus. But it was not on Olympus, and it was associated with the cult of Orpheus, which had the same mystic quality as the cult of Dionysus. In fact, since there was a river Helicon in Pieria²², and a Leibethron²³, too, another Boeotian name associated with the Heliconian Muses, we may claim Orphic origin for the Muses of Hesiod. What form the myth had before his time we can only conjecture. Let us rather turn to the myth of the Muse in our earliest literary source, the Homeric poems.

II

What a difference we find here from Plato's Muses, who make men mad, and from Hesiod's, too, who know fiction as well as truth, future as well as past, and who inspire with poetic language! Homer's Muses are Olympian, never Heliconian or Pierian. They never come from a valley or a spring. Homer doubtless knew of the origin of the Muses as nymphs lurking in cave or spring, and 'possessing' the minds of those who had eyes and ears for them—his casual reference to their contest with Thamyris²⁴ indicates this. But Homer treats the Muses as he treats the gods: he places them on Olympus. He has little interest in the chthonian powers, except when he is telling of adventures in fairyland. Elsewhere in his poems the supernatural influence comes chiefly from above, from amid the 'bright-flashing splendor'²⁵ of Olympus, not from the gloom of caves or the hidden depths of springs. Homer nationalized the Greek gods by freeing them from many of the peculiarities of their local cults, and then he gave permanence to this conception by the vividness with which in his Olympian scenes he makes them live for us as members of a divine nobility—peers of Heaven, among whom are the Muses.

These princesses of Heaven, whose home is on Olympus, form the choir of the gods. They appear twice in the action of the poems, each time singing solo parts alternately²⁶. In the first book of the Iliad the gods are merry and find entertainment in their sweet song; in the last book of the Odyssey we learn that the gods mourned for Achilles, and that their choir went to Troy to assist Thetis in her mourning.

¹⁵Certamen 210-214, in *Homeri Opera*, edited by T. W. Allen, Volume 5, page 233.

¹⁶Posthomerica 3.594, 785. ¹⁷Isthmia 8.57. ¹⁸Propertius 3.3.1-6.

¹⁹See Anthologia Palatina 7.42.

²⁰Isthmia 2.34, 8.57. ²¹Olympia 10.96, *et passim*.

²²Pausanias 9.30.8 (for the River Helicon).

²³Strabo 7, page 330; Pausanias 9.30.9, 9.34.4.

²⁴Iliad 2.395.

²⁵Sophocles, Antigone 609-610.

²⁶Iliad 1.604; Odyssey 24.60-62.

If only Homer had told us the theme of the Muses's first song, on that memorable evening on Olympus, when they made their début in literature! But in spite of his reticence, Homer fixed his stamp on the Muses. What the Muse means in the Homeric poems is really rather simple.

I cannot find in Homer convincing evidence for the commonly-accepted view that the poet regarded either himself or any of his bards as the 'mouthpiece of the Muse'. The phrase, 'spokesman of the Muses'²⁷, is found first in a fragment of Pindar²⁸, and goes back, apparently, to the Heliconian tradition. In Homer, the bards who are 'taught of the Muse'²⁹ are no more to be regarded as spokesmen of their teacher than the men whom Hephaestus or Athena taught are to be regarded as the agents of either of these divinities³⁰. When Homer bids the Muse to relate, he is merely calling on the keepers of the poetic store to disburse the portion which he needs. He never invokes the Muse or the Muses in his more lyric passages, before his speeches, or at his highly emotional climaxes. He calls on them for the facts, for the *klea andron*. The Muse incites Demodocus to sing, it is true, but it is to sing *klea andron*³¹; when this bard sings of the love of Aphrodite and Ares, the poet does not say that the Muse incited him³². Why are the Muses invoked to tell the celebrated deeds of heroes? Because, we are told, they are present and know all things, whereas the poet is familiar only with hearsay, and does not *know*³³. Odysseus tells Demodocus that the Muse must have taught him, for he sings of the Trojan War as if he had been present himself, or had heard the tale at first-hand³⁴. This makes the Muse in reality the daughter of Memory and Zeus, the personification of the remembered utterance of Zeus.

The Voice of God has always been a thrilling and puissant conception. When there were no records, no literature written on tablets which might be consulted, the human mind found in this Voice of God the final seal of authentication upon its tradition. The *Ossa Dios*, which brings to men the surest tidings³⁵, naturally becomes the ultimate voucher for the truth of the *klea andron*. The Muse in Homer is essentially remembered story, passed on, no doubt, from one generation of bards to another. She is the Voice of the Past with all the authority of divine sanction. Hence, as we meet her first in literature, the Muse stands for the winnowed and glorified heritage of a people, its history, upon which it has impressed the stamp of its own most characteristic view of life³⁶.

III

If, then, there is no evidence in Homer—and I find

²⁷Plato, Phaedrus 262 D.

²⁸Pindar, Frag. 90 (Bergk). ²⁹Odyssey 8.481.

³⁰Odyssey 6.233. ³¹Odyssey 8.73. ³²Odyssey 8.266.

³³Iliad 2.485-486.

³⁴Odyssey 8.488-491. It is true that in this passage Apollo is also mentioned as the possible teacher of Demodocus. But, since in other passages the Muses know the past, since nowhere else in the Homeric poems does Apollo inspire a poet with knowledge of the past, and since Apollo never sings himself in Homer, it seems probable to me that the reference to Apollo here involves rather allusion to the excellence of the bard's musical accompaniment.

³⁵Odyssey 1.282-283.

³⁶George Woodberry, *The Torch*, Chapter II, especially page 29 (1920).

none—for the mystic, maddening, ecstasizing influence of the Muse, "What sets the wind of inspiration blowing?" Whence does Homer hint that the poetic soul wings itself for flight, if the Muse determines only the Where and the Whither? We find an answer in Plato's *Cratylus*³⁷. 'Apollo', *Cratylus* explains, 'is he who soars aloft'. This is not serious etymology, but it may serve to lead us to the evidence that, in Homer, Apollo may stand for the source of the poetic power, which, according to the Heliconian tradition, the Muses give.

In the age which Homer describes, poetry is always linked with music. This is true of Achilles³⁸, *Phemius*³⁹, *Demodocus*⁴⁰: each sings *klea andron* to the accompaniment of his own lyre. On Olympus, Apollo's lyre and the Muses's song are mentioned together⁴¹. In Homer Apollo never sings, and the Muses never play the lyre. Sometimes the Muse may seem to be the source of the poet's song⁴²: she gave *Demodocus* sweet song; she incited him to sing *klea andron*; she loves famous bards and teaches them lays. But, on the other hand, the source is also described as *theos* ('god', or 'the god')⁴³: *theos* gave song abundantly to *Demodocus*; *Demodocus* is incited by *theos* to sing, and *theos* implanted lays in the heart of *Phemius*. We can therefore be sure that in Homer at least the entire source of the poet's power is not centered in the Muses; it was also regarded as a merely divine gift, and Apollo seems to be the most probable giver. The passage which is most important for my argument is that in which *Odysseus* says to the *Phaeacian* bard⁴⁴:

Demodocus, I praise thee above all mortals; either the Muse. . . was thy teacher or Apollo. So fitly dost thou sing of the destruction of the Achaeans. . . . But come, pass to the building of the Wooden Horse. . . . If thou wilt relate me this tale fitly, straightway I will tell the world that god hath bountifully bestowed song upon thee". Thus he spake; and the bard, incited of god, began, and revealed his lay'.

This is the fullest statement in Homer of the source of the poet's power: 'either the Muse or. . . Apollo'; and the impulse to sing comes from god (or the god). It is a foundation too slight for us to rebuild upon it with certainty the earliest theory of the Muse and the poet, but it may serve as the basis of a certain 'wise myth' of poetry.

In this 'myth' the Muse and Apollo personify, respectively, the matter and the manner of poetry—the stuff out of which it is made, that is, ideas expressed in human speech, and the force which shapes it into a pattern, the music. Music implies order and form and aesthetic emotion. Its essence is rhythm; and rhythm sways the uncoordinated material of poetry into symmetrical arrangement, just as the lyre of *Demodocus* made the feet of the *Phaeacian* princes keep time with its measures. *Havelock Ellis*⁴⁵ tells us that life is a dance. This may be true of the physical aspect of life. But the life of the mind and the soul—at least the most intense life—is a song, and the poet with the rhythm of his music calls this into order. The order or *kosmos*

which the poet brings out of chaos is illustrated by many great examples in literature. *Dionysus* in the *Progs*⁴⁶ says that *Aeschylus* gave order to the haphazard utterance of tragedy, and so became the first tragic poet. *Aristophanes*, we are told⁴⁷, using more art than his predecessors, reduced comedy to *kosmos*, and shone preeminent. And of Homer himself *Democritus*⁴⁸ said that, having received a divine nature, Homer wrought out of all kinds of tales a *kosmos*.

But *kosmos* or order must be expressed in something which our senses can grasp.

In the realm of things visible, the world as we know it by the sense of sight, *kosmos* gives rise to form, which is for the beholder the garment of rhythm. In nature, forms are infinitely varied, but they do not hide from the seeing eye the element of rhythm, for this is the organic principle, which introduces a unity among countless variants. Thus form mediates between the one and the many, interpreting the one by the many. In poetry, form is the nice adjustment of the speech to the pattern. It thus holds the balance between the two opposing principles, the freedom of thought and speech—the wide-roving fancy of the poet on the one hand, and the law of rhythm. The truer this balance is, the more perfect is the form. What is more perfect in form than one of the choral odes of *Sophocles*, in which music has trued the balance? And what makes the best prose fall so far short of this perfection, if it is not the lack of the musical accompaniment in its early development?

Music does something more than give order and form. It somehow stirs our pulses to a faster beat. It acts upon us with a mysterious power, deepening our latent emotions by what we call, for lack of a better understanding of its nature, the sense of beauty. The first *Achaean* bard put forth a common idea from the Muse's store with a greater beauty which he gave to it with his music.

Hence Apollo and the Muses, as they appear at the very beginning of all our Western literature, when Homer describes the first song on Olympus, may be interpreted as a union of the one and the many. The former marshals the myriads of thoughts and words into an organism that we can grasp with our minds, moulds them into forms that with infinite variety interpret the rhythm of our emotional world, and clothes them with beauty, which with mysterious power, as we contemplate the forms, lifts us into harmony and sympathy with something above us. The first poet was not the spokesman of a divinity, a passive subject moved by some external power; he was rather himself a creator. His power was that unexplainable yearning within him to mould thought and speech into beautiful forms in keeping with the law which we call the ideal, but which to Homer was *theos*. And the Muse's inspiration, according to Homer, comes chiefly from the power of her accumulated store.

³⁷405 C-D. ³⁸*Iliad* 9.186-189. ³⁹*Odyssey* 1.155, 326.

⁴⁰*Odyssey* 8.73. ⁴¹*Iliad* 1.603-604. ⁴²*Odyssey* 8.63, 73, 481.

⁴³*Odyssey* 8.34, 498, 499, 22.347. ⁴⁴*Odyssey* 8.488-499.

⁴⁵*The Dance of Life*, page 65 (1923).

⁴⁶*Aristophanes, Progs* 1004-1005.

⁴⁷By *Tzetzes*. See *Kaibel, Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 1.18.

⁴⁸*Dio Chrysostom, Oratio* 33, lines 1-3.

IV

Poets are many; the great are those who have increased the Muse's store by reason of the superlative excellence with which they have given rhythm and form and beauty to the thought of mankind. Renan calls the great Roman and Greek historians poets. So we may extend the term *poet*, and let it include all the great makers of literature, and we may hold classical literature to be in a peculiar sense the legacy of the classic Muse. The source of the poet's power we may find in the springs of Helicon, in the spirit of nature, in the primitive impulses of man. But we may also think of this power not as the start, but as the magnet or the goal of the upward endeavor, and see in rhythm and form and beauty the universal element, the star to which every true poet must hitch his wagon. Then the Muse becomes Olympian, the store of all the memorable parts of the history that has made us what we are, the past, but the past idealized. The world to-day has too little use for the idealized past, because it regards this as the object of ineffective and unproductive contemplation. In its blindness the world fails to see that, when the past is glorified and beautified, transmuted into a 'wise myth', as it were, it may become a source of power in the constructive ideas of the present. It was the glorified past that inspired Homer and made the Homeric poems exercise in the realm of beautiful thought an influence that has not yet lost its potency.

The glorified past, then, is the Muse that we find in Homer, dwelling on Olympus, not, as to-day, "six flights up in an out-of-date apartment house" in some Greenwich Village. For, as Walter Map⁴⁰, towards the end of the Middle Ages, voiced the never out-of-date cry, "The Muses are changed with the world's changes". The Muse was idealized on Olympus, mysticized on Helicon, specialized at Alexandria and in Rome, individualized after the Renaissance, and to-day—ostracized! It is a long journey that she has taken from Olympus to Greenwich Village. Is she to die there in a neglected old age? A fragment assigned in antiquity to Hesiod⁴¹, who learned the future from the lips of the Muses themselves, assures us that a nymph—and consequently the Muse—outlives more than nine thousand lives of man. Therefore, in describing her present state, we seem to have stumbled on the right word, the old Greek term, *ostracized*, banished, but for a brief period. She will return—someday!

But the legacy of the Muse remains; and the grammarian remains. Gilbert Murray has reminded us⁴² that grammarians are the keepers of *la grammata*, the form in which memorable thought has come down to us. We are therefore the guardians of the Muse's legacy, and the guardian must not treat lightly his obligations.

The duties of the grammarian-guardian are many. He must be a teacher, instructing the heirs in the use of

the legacy, and inspiring them with the desire to use it. The Classical Associations concern themselves with this duty. He must also be a preacher, rousing the world to the value of the legacy. The American Classical League, what one might call the Liaison Division of the Grammarian Army, under the command of its organizer, General West, is advancing victoriously towards this objective. And, thirdly, the grammarian must be a scholar, keeping the fund of the legacy pure by criticism, increasing it by research, and making the income available by turning it into currency that will pass, that is, by an interpretation that meets the needs of the times. This three-fold obligation rests upon our Association. We might well take time to consider what it is doing and what more it may reasonably be expected to do.

But I think there is a more pressing problem, to look to the future of the legacy, and to provide for a line of increasingly effective guardians.

The situation which we face here presents three disquieting features. One is the public attitude towards the Classics. At first glance this seems not unfavorable. Classical ideas are still essential threads in the fabric of contemporary thought. But if we ask ourselves why this first diagnosis is so favorable, we must answer that it is chiefly because for a century and more those who believe in the cultivation of the mind and the enjoyment thereof have been trained in Latin and in Greek. The men of most influence to-day, the *gerontes* and those of the *kathestekua helikia*, are more or less steeped in the Classics. But what of the *iuvenes*? Small Latin—I mean Latin literature—and far less Greek have they. This means that, when the younger generation assumes the complete leadership of thought, it will either not care for the Muse's legacy, or else it will know this legacy only at second-hand. In either case, unless there is some counteracting force, there will be a decline in the power of the classic influence.

This will be made worse by the dwindling of the numbers of classical scholars in America. Our classical faculties, instead of expanding to keep pace with the growth of the country, are scarcely holding their own. Think of the possible situation in twenty-five years, especially if the Classics offer in competition with other activities no adequate career to young men of most brilliant promise—the Gildersleeves and the Goodwins and the Seymours and the Shoreys—which the next generation needs!

And, thirdly, this gloomy picture of a possible future of classical scholarship in America—gloomy only because we are not yet definitely planning to prevent it from becoming a reality—is looming up at a critical moment. Fourteen years ago, Professor Shorey urged us to seek new foreign guides and new models in our scholarship⁴³. Then the World War came, and from it our country emerged as a not improbable leader of the world. If this leadership shall come, and shall not include classical scholarship, it will be incomplete, and

⁴⁰Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium, Courtiers' Trifles*, Translated by F. Tupper and M. B. Ogle, 181 (London, Chatto and Windus, 1924).

⁴¹Plutarch, *De Defectu Oraculorum* 11, page 415 C.

⁴²In his paper *Religio Grammatici*, incorporated now in a volume entitled *Tradition and Progress* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1922; see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 18.105-106). See pages 13-18.

⁴³This appeal was contained in his Presidential Address to the American Philological Association, in December, 1910. A modified version of the Address was reprinted in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.226-230.

both America and the world will be the losers. Leadership of the world in classical scholarship is possible, not in the present generation, nor in the next, but ultimately, if our needs can be met. May I indicate the general nature of these needs by pointing out some specific needs?

One is a guarantee of permanency, by means of endowment, to the chair of Greek and the chair of Latin in every College that teaches the Classics, so that no bouleversement of educational ideals may deprive any College of productive scholarship in the Classics. In the larger institutions there should be, also, research professorships or lectureships, and research fellowships, too, just as much as in the fields of pure science and applied science.

Secondly, we need a fund of large amount the income from which shall be available for classical purposes. Think what the Loeb Foundation and the grant to the American Classical League have accomplished, and then picture what is possible in Latin and Greek if a large annual grant could be assured. New text-books, for example, could be had dated at least since the birth of those who study them, covering a wide range of authors, and meeting the needs of students who have a new outlook on life. Remember that Gildersleeve's Justin Martyr, with its wealth of syntactical lore, was a text-book that owed its preparation and its publication to an endowment¹³. And there are many *opera majora* to be produced, the more proper work of the grammarian, for example, a great history of Greek literature, something far more than a handbook, which should among other things interpret the old authors in a new spirit. For the Classics offer an attractive field to the coming generation, not only to extend the boundaries of knowledge by research, but also to test and sift the work of the last century, and to give a new valuation to Greek and Roman literature.

And, finally, a most pressing need is one which our Secretary has had in his mind for several years: a comprehensive and exhaustive periodical survey of recent classical books and discussions, conceived and carried out with the cooperation of many scholars. A work of this kind will serve several important ends. It will keep informed and stimulated the teacher of the Classics in a small College, and by enlisting his aid will give a further impetus to his efforts. And so we shall come to have what we must have if classical scholarship is to keep up with other similar activities in America, at least one specialist who can speak with authority on each important author and field in Latin and in Greek.

I hear the objection that there are already excellent foreign bibliographies and summaries. True; but, if we lean on others for support, even if they can do the work better than we can hope to do it at first, we shall never develop our own powers. And one might also answer that before the Great War there were excellent foreign monetary units, but to-day the world's exchange is quoted in the dollar. And so in our discussion the dollar has appeared at last, as every foreigner knows that it

will appear, sooner or later, in America. And yet we must not hesitate to link the idea of the dollar with the legacy of the Muse. For this is the only way in which we can bring about a parity of the American unit in the exchange of the world's ideas about the Classics. *Every lover of the Classics must feel, and must give emphatic and effective utterance to his feeling, that to-day in America both the scientific study of the Classics, and the scholars' interpretation based on this study deserve and must obtain the same generous support that is being given to other scientific efforts, and to other agencies that contribute to the improvement of American culture.* In making such utterance, we shall not be pleading for ourselves. A movement for endowment in the ways that I have mentioned, or in other better ways will take time for organization and development. By the time that the results are available for use, the burden will be passing from our shoulders to those of our successors. It is for them that we shall be pleading, for the coming generation of the Muse's guardians, and for the heirs, the Americans of to-morrow.

This plea will not be made in vain if a concerted and well-considered movement is begun at once, while the men of great influence and wealth in America still—so many of them—love the Classics. In this rich land there are few failures to obtain generous financial support for needed purposes. Cast your eyes over our many foundations and endowments and Museums and memorials! Suppose that a great classical fund were to be established in memory of Gildersleeve—and what memorial could be more fitting?—, would there not be a rallying to its support of many powerful and wealthy men, who loved him, admired him, were proud of him, and who are bound to perpetuate his memory appropriately and adequately?

We have wandered from the Muses and Apollo. Let us loyally return, Philology, in our imagination, leading Finance as a willing helper, and let us make a little clearer to ourselves why we are adding a fourth partner to the three whose activities lie in the realm of beautiful thought. The gold of Midas brought him no cheer. The wealth of a land will not bring its full return in happiness unless some of it is interpreted in beauty. If a trifle of this wealth is put at our disposal to help us in our efforts to make the Classics a greater force in shaping the culture of America, we must be the effective assistants of the poets, of all the great *makers* of classic literature. We are only journey-men, but the artisan works under the artist, and passes on his inspiration to others. This is the highest duty of the grammarian. Let us look at this duty under a parable¹⁴.

A poet-lover came home from a walk on a winter afternoon, threw himself on the hearth-rug, and turned the pages of a volume of verse, reading by the light of the hearth-fire. Then, after some minutes, he rose, went to the window, and continued his reading by the daylight; but somehow some of the charm of the poetry was gone.

¹³Suggested by a passage in *The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft*, by George Gissing (New York, Boni and Liveright, 1918).

¹⁴The Douglass Endowment.

The meaning of the parable is this. The light of science—the productive, creative science of philology—is clear, like the daylight; and like the daylight it is absolutely necessary for the life of the scholar. But it is not enough, for, as the daylight sometimes is, it is also cold. The philologist must kindle from the poet's fire a hearth-fire of his own, whose flame shall illuminate his philology, and communicate brightness and warmth and cheer to the world. We grammarians are not high priests of art, but we are a very useful lower order in the hierarchy, and we can share in the duties of the priesthood. "And this is the priesthood of art, not to bestow upon the universe a new aspect, but upon the beholder a new enthusiasm"¹⁸.

Of Gildersleeve a French scholar has recently written¹⁹: 'He knew how to unite the rigor of science with the enthusiasm which is the indispensable bond of fruitful communion between the master and his hearers'. Our best tribute to the memory of this Olympian of grammarians will be to take him as our model: to pursue our science rigorously, and at the same time to bestow upon our hearers and upon our readers a new enthusiasm, new to many an American to-day, but old as the days of Hesiod, when the Heliconian sisters breathed their power into the hearts of men, an enthusiasm not for the pragmatic, nor for the scientific only, but for "that finer breath and tuft of all science", the fairest flower of nature springing up in the heart of man, which in our 'wise myth' we have called the legacy of the Muse and her poet.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

REVIEW

Theory of Advanced Greek Prose Composition With Digest of Greek Idioms. 3 Volumes. By John Donovan. Oxford: Basil Blackwood (1921, 1922, 1924). Pp. 484. 5 sh., 7 sh., 5 sh.

Father Donovan's work, *Theory of Advanced Greek Prose Composition*, was published in three volumes, the contents of which are subdivided into three parts. Volume I (1-124) contains the major part of Part I, Functions and Equivalents of the Subordinate Clause and of the Parts of Speech. Volume II (125-317) gives the remainder of Part I, and Part 2, Fundamental Differences, complete. Volume III (319-484) contains Part 3, Minor Differences (319-452), and Index to English Words and Expressions (453-484).

The treatise contains a good deal of valuable material for the scholar; it is unfortunate that the arrangement makes it rather difficult for handling by less advanced students.

The large collections of examples are evidence of so much learning and industry that it seems ungracious to criticize. To the present reviewer, however, there appear to be two serious blemishes in this, the main part of the work: (1) omission in many instances to quote the authors from whom the examples are drawn, and the in-

clusion of some distinctly outside the canon of Attic prose; (2) defects in the English translations of the Greek.

(1) In the larger number of examples no references at all to the author are given. The references that are given show the most various methods of quotation. Thus we find sometimes "Thuc.", "Dem.", etc., sometimes fuller forms. Again, Demosthenes is referred to sometimes by Roman numerals, sometimes by Arabic, sometimes by the titles of the speeches. This is a trifling matter, but the absence of any reference at all in the majority of the examples entails an immense amount of labor in verification by the student, for, as already stated, the examples are drawn from a much wider array of authors than most users of the book, who, *ex hypothesi*, would have a high standard of Greek prose composition, would admit as canonical.

I shall say nothing of Father Donovan's use of Xenophon. Isocrates is, of course, legitimate material, but a disproportionate amount seems to be quoted from him. I have not made an actual count, but the impression left after a careful reading is that more named quotations are given from him than from any other author, while a large number of the unattributed examples also prove, when looked up, to be from him. On page 151, after more than two pages of examples of *ἐχθρῶς* with an adverb, Father Donovan says, "Almost all the foregoing are from the first three speeches of Isocrates", and he then mentions ten other adverbs used by Isocrates in a similar way with *ἐχθρῶς*. Isocrates should not supply so much of the material. However, Isocrates has a secure place in the canon of Attic orators. What shall we say of Plutarch? I do not think he is named, but many examples are taken from him, e. g. on pages 241, 243, 298, 299. Aristotle often appears, and Aristophanes sometimes (not always with the reference), and the tragedians, though I think they are generally indicated. The book would have been far more useful if the examples had been drawn, in the main, from Thucydides, Plato, Demosthenes, and Lysias, without, of course, excluding the other orators.

(2) The fact that the English equivalents given for the Greek are often open to criticism is a serious matter in a book to be used by students. One of the cornerstones of the argument for the Classics in education is their influence in producing elegance and precision in the use of English. "If gold rust, what shall iron do?" In a few places the translations are wrong. Thus, on page 50, the well-known remark of Socrates at the beginning of Plato, *Apology*, ἀτεχνῶς εἰδώς ἔχω περὶ τῆς ἐνθάδε λέξεως, which means 'I am quite unacquainted with the language of the law-courts', is translated by "I am quite unacquainted with the local dialect here"! The quotation is too familiar to be given a different meaning apart from its context; in any case, λέξις does not seem to be used of a local dialect. Another quotation (107) from the *Apology* is even more unfortunate; ἐν ᾧ οἱ ἐνδεκα ἀσχολίας ἄγουσι, 'while the Eleven are busy', is translated by "whilst the eleven are unoccupied (disengaged)". Again, on page

¹⁸Max Eastman, *Enjoyment of Poetry*, 197 (1914).

¹⁹Th. Reinach, in *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, July, 1924, page 42.

276, *καταχαρίζονται τὰ δίκαια* is translated by "they friller away men's rights in compliments", where the meaning is 'they give their judgments by favor' as opposed to judgments in accordance with right (Plato, *Apology* 35 C; the context makes the point clear).

More often the English equivalent does not seem a sufficiently accurate rendering of the Greek, or vice versa. On page 158, under "Counterbalance", "His good services do not counterbalance his shortcomings" is rendered by *οὐ τοσοῦτον εὐεργετῇ δόσον πλημμελεῖ* (*ἀμαρτάνει*), and on page 80, under "Complications", "for fear of complications" is rendered by *μὴ γένοιτό τι πλημμελές*. Neither of these English metaphors corresponds at all to the metaphor in *πλημμελής*. Further, on page 157, under "Complicate", "not to complicate matters" is rendered by *μὴ χειρόν ἔχει τὰ πράγματα* (also on page 80). There are many similar examples. Of course, if it is merely meant to suggest to the student that an English metaphor like "complicated" is outworn, and not likely to have an identical Greek equivalent, and that some substitute must be sought, no objection can be raised; but Father Donovan would probably be as much annoyed as any other teacher if his pupils produced 'complicated' for *πλημμελής* when they were translating Plato, rather than some word like 'discordant', 'inharmonious', which attempts to retain the metaphor.

Most teachers doubtless try to impress upon their pupils the general rule that in a Greek passage the same Greek word must be translated by the same English word throughout, and, conversely, that different Greek words should be translated by different English words. It is therefore discouraging to find, on page 53, "It is as disgraceful to have no friends as frequently to change them" offered as the equivalent of *Ὁμοίως γὰρ αἰσχρὸν μὴδένα φίλον ἔχειν καὶ πολλοὺς ἐταίρους μεταλλάττειν*, where not only are the Greek nouns different, but one is singular, and one is plural.

There are a good many examples of unnecessarily elaborate translation of very simple Greek. For instance, on page 242, Cleon's expression, *διὰ τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν δδεῖν*, Thucydides 3.37, 'on account of the security of your daily life', is rendered by "owing to the inapprehensive frankness of your daily intercourse".

Father Donovan calls the verb "the most important factor in Greek prose". This of course cannot be too strongly emphasized. But rather unluckily Father Donovan goes on at once to give various examples of the use of *ποιεῖσθαι* with a noun, without frankly admitting that this idiom is in many instances a close equivalent of the English, e. g. in his first example, "Let us embark on the voyage", *ποιώμεθα τὸν πλοῦν*. In these idioms, where the Greek verb is colorless and all the meaning is derived from the noun, Greek and English are not far apart, and it would have been better to make this point clearer.

There is a dark saying on page 198:

The Greek participle is the normal equivalent of English participles, with very few exceptions. The English verbal noun, participial in its modern form, cannot always be rendered by a Greek participle, notably when the former is *nominative* in *purely predicative*

statements, e. g. Teaching is useful. *Τὸ διδάσκειν ὠφέλιμον*. Teaching has its advantages. *Τὸ διδάσκειν λυσιτελεῖ τι*. On the other hand, the Greek participle will be in place in such sentences as the following: Teaching does not bring wealth. *Διδάσκων οὐ πλουτῇσεις*. Learning comes of teaching. *Διδάσκων τις μαθήσεται*.

It does not seem clear what the opening sentence of this passage has to do with the rest, as all the English examples present verbal nouns, not participles; but nothing further is given to explain or illustrate the statement.

There is an excellent chapter on Directness and the Comparative Absence of Personification in Greek (295-303). In this we find the following statement:

To the Greek observer the person alone is the agent. In modern speech, on the contrary, almost any idea may be personified. . . Accordingly, in translating English of this kind, the student must ask himself who is the person who has *done the thing*.

Having discovered this he has the nominative of his sentence, the remainder of which must be recast to suit the Greek point of view.

After this come copious examples, both of the principle and of the exceptions to it.

Some admirable remarks are found at the beginning of the chapter on Functions of the Greek Substantive (75).

The uses of the substantive for the purposes of Greek Prose Composition are extremely limited. . . All concrete objects expressed by a noun in English will readily pass into Greek under their corresponding concrete names. A vocabulary of this class of words will be readily acquired from reading. Should the student's memory fail to furnish the proper word for any material object, reference may be made to an English-Greek lexicon; and this is the only useful purpose to which such books may be put.

It should perhaps be noted that Part II, Fundamental Differences, was the first compiled, and it is suggested in the Preface that students should begin by assimilating the general principles there set forth, with the sensible statement that, in a work of this kind, the classification cannot rest on a strictly logical basis. Part III is not yet published, but references are made to it in Parts I and II. Among other subjects the whole treatment of *Oratio Obliqua* is reserved for Part III.

BARNARD COLLEGE

GERTRUDE M. HIRST

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

XIV

Art and Archaeology—March, Ancient Basilicas of Carthage and the Early Christian Ruins of North Africa, Byron Khun de Prorok [illustrated].—April, The American Excavation at Nemea, Season of 1924, Carl W. Blegen [illustrated]; Review, by A. D. Fraser, of G. Elliot Smith and W. R. Dawson, *Egyptian Mummies*; Review, by C. D. Lamberton, of C. R. Morey, *The Sarcophagus of Claudia Antonia Sabina* <discovered by the late Howard Crosby Butler, at Sardis> and the Asiatic Sarcophagi; Review, by Mitchell Carroll, of D. M. Robinson, *Sappho and her Influence*.

CHARLES KNAPP

¹After the above was written, Part III was received. It seems full of valuable matter. Chapter XVIII, Unity of the Greek Sentence and Use of Pronouns (374-400), may be especially noted. The Index To English Words and Expressions, covering all three volumes, will be of great service.